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bites its arm; they happen because the animal catches the arm in some part of the cage. Cages could be modified to prevent this without too much trouble. The IBR cages had no such modifications — instead many had broken wires, some of which protruded into the living area of the cage.

Dr. Taub could also have considered the possibility of pulling the canines of the monkeys (and perhaps even the incisors) as a possible means of preventing serious self-mutilation. Of course, such a course of action in itself raises new questions about animal welfare but, in this case, it may have been better for the overall welfare of the animals to perform the operation.

In the final analysis, we have no doubt that the conditions under which the animals were kept, conditions that had been documented in 1977 (by the USDA and the NIH) and then again in 1981, were totally unacceptable. The scientist’s responsibility to provide the best possible care for the animals that are used in biomedical research was definitely not met.

Other scientists who perceive this case as a threat to the whole process of laboratory experimentation will not help the growing debate over ethical issues in animal research if they rush to defend the conditions at IBR. In the final analysis, the intentions or affiliation of Pacheco, the whistle blower, are irrelevant. Even without his testimony and his photographs, evidence given by the police and other witnesses clearly demonstrates that the care and sanitation were well below professionally accepted standards. And it is not only animal welfare supporters who feel this way. One practicing research scientist, with extensive experience in research on primates, has stated to me that: if this, in fact, represents the current standard of medical research in this country, then it should be stopped.

(The details of the case, with relevant background material, are given elsewhere in this issue of the Journal).
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The word “dominion,” which is interpreted by many as equivalent to “domination,” is defined primarily (in Webster’s dictionary) as indicating “sovereignty.” Roget’s International Thesaurus interprets dominion as “realm, domain or jurisdiction” and therefore makes “dominion,” “domination,” “sovereignty,” and “supremacy” synonymous. Thus, the passage in Genesis 1:26 that proclaims that man has “dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth,” can be interpreted as meaning that he has been granted sovereignty, jurisdiction, or domination. The passage does not state, however, to what degree humans, as dominionists or sovereigns, may exploit the rest of creation: no ethical limits are set. Thus, the term “dominion” is ambiguous insofar as it does not denote to what degree humans, as dominionists or sovereigns, may
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